DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 619 CS 007 069

AUTHOR Hayes, Mary Vidolin
TITLE A Survey of Teacher Attitudes towards In-Class Versus Pull-Out Compensatory Reading Programs.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 38p.; M.A. Thesis, Kean College of New Jersey.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Grouping (Instructional Purposes); Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; *Reading Research; *Remedial Reading; *Special Education; *Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This study was an attempt to replicate the results of a master's thesis by Marie Davis (Kean College, New Jersey, 1982) in which teachers' attitudes towards pull-out (student leaves the regular classroom for instruction by the compensatory reading teacher) and in-class (compensatory reading teacher works with the child within the confines of the regular classroom) compensatory reading programs were surveyed. In the current study, approximately 200 elementary school teachers in the Elizabeth, New Jersey Public School District completed opinionnaires (attitude scales). The Elizabeth School District was chosen for the study because it provides in-class, pull-out and combination compensatory reading programs. Results revealed that most teachers had negative attitudes toward in-class compensatory reading programs, and that most favored the pull-out programs. These results differ from the conclusions of the Davis study. When Davis administered the same opinionnaire in different school districts, she found that teachers surveyed preferred an in-class compensatory program. The discrepancy in results suggests the need for further research on this topic. A review of research related to compensatory education and the nine-item opinionnaire are included. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED228619

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A SURVEY OF TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARDS IN-CLASS VERSUS PULL-OUT COMPENSATORY READING PROGRAMS

by

Mary Vidolin Hayes

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement
for the Master of Arts degree in Education at
Kean College of New Jersey
April 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary Vidolin Hayes
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS007069

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research study was to determine whether there is a significant difference between teacher attitudes towards a pull-out versus an in-class compensatory reading program.

An opinionnaire was administered to the teachers at the elementary level in the Elizabeth Public School District. Elizabeth was selected because it provides an in-class, a pull-out, and a combination compensatory reading program.

The results of this study demonstrated that there is a significant difference between teacher attitudes towards a pull-out versus an in-class compensatory reading program. A large percentage of the teachers surveyed exhibited a negative attitude towards in-class compensatory reading programs. A significant number of teachers suggested that a pull-out compensatory reading program be implemented in their school district.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I ABSTRACT	i
II LIST OF TABLES	iii
III INTRODUCTION	1
Hypothesis	3
Definitions	4
Limitations	4
Delimitations	5
Procedure	5
Results	7
Conclusions	15
Implications	17
IV RELATED RESEARCH	18
V REFERENCES	29

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	PULL-OUT VERSUS IN-CLASS COMPENSATORY READING PROGRAMS	8

Compensatory programs have developed from a growing awareness of the fact that children from low-income families do not achieve in school. The federal government has provided schools with the funding in an attempt to compensate for the deficits of these disadvantaged children. Evaluators of such programs have spent their time looking for evidence to justify the continuation or discontinuation of federally funded programs (Cooley, 1981). Their time would be better spent in looking for ways to improve the education of disadvantaged children. Recommendations have included improved teacher training, new methods of evaluation, and enhancing the integrity of schools (Calfee and Drum, 1979). A Phi Delta Kappa Study of Exceptional Urban Elementary Schools associated their success with effective leadership, teacher training programs, and a structured learning environment (Levine, 1982).

Research has demonstrated that teacher attitude has a direct effect on student attitude and performance. Teaching the disadvantaged is a specialized task and requires that the teacher be warm, accepting, supportive, and nonpunitive (Gordon and Wilkerson, 1966). If the teacher has a positive attitude and believes that children can learn, the teaching-learning process will be effective. Alexander and Filler (1976) state that interest, attitude, motivation, locus of control, self-concept, feelings, and emotions are important to reading because they provide the child with the desire to read. Davis (1978) reviewed 110 research studies published between 1900 and 1977. She suggests that teachers become aware of students' attitudes and that careful planning can help learners develop positive attitudes.

Since research shows that there is a direct correlation between teacher attitude and the attitudes of the student, more attention should be given to this topic. Could there be a detrimental effect on the child if the teacher has a negative

attitude towards a particular program?

Compensatory programs in the state of New Jersey are presently In-Class or Pull-Out programs, or a combination of the two. An In-Class program is one in which the compensatory reading teacher works with the child within the confines of the regular classroom. This type of program provides an opportunity for both the classroom and the compensatory reading teacher to communicate since they are both working in the same room. It may also enable the classroom teacher to become aware of program objectives. This type of a program also has its limitations. With two teachers working within the confines of one room, there might be interruptions of either or both lessons. The child may also feel that he has been singled out from the rest of the class since he is being remediated in front of his classmates.

A Pull-Out program is one in which the student leaves the regular classroom for instruction by the compensatory reading teacher. This program provides a new and different learning environment. It usually enables the compensatory teacher to plan and implement lessons of a less restrictive type, if she/he is not sharing the room. The limitations of a Pull-Out program include the interruptions of the regular classroom when the child leaves or returns from remedial instruction. It also places restrictions on the amount of communication between the classroom and the compensatory reading teacher.

This study is of tremendous significance to educational theory and practice. At some point in their teaching career, every teacher will be placed in a situation where a child in their class requires a remedial service. Whether it is a Pull-Out program or within the confines of the regular classroom, the teacher will soon realize that each type of program has its assets and limitations.

Until an alternative approach to this problem has been created, we are faced with the dilemma of choosing between the two. This study will determine if a Pull-Out compensatory reading program has a more significant effect upon the learning environment. If this is true, then it would require school districts to analyze, re-evaluate, and possibly revamp programs presently in existence.

This study is also significant because it is concerned with the teacher's viewpoint. Too often, decision-making concerning educational programs and curriculum are by those far removed from the educational scene. A teacher who is exposed to a particular situation everyday would be better equipped to give input as to the success or failure of a remedial program. Therefore, it would be to the benefit of all, to obtain information from teachers as to what has or has not been successful in the past and for suggestions for future endeavors.

HYPOTHESIS

There will be a significant difference between teacher attitudes towards a pull-out versus an in-class compensatory reading program.

This study will test several minor hypotheses. First, the results will demonstrate that classroom teachers have a negative attitude towards in-class compensatory reading programs, second that the importance of a teacher's attitudes upon the learning environment of the child will be revealed. It will also attempt to determine whether teachers believe that a pull-out reading program provides the best learning environment for the remediation of the child. It will also investigate whether a compensatory reading program within the

self-contained classroom, as opposed to the pull-out variety, provides a better opportunity for communication between the classroom and the remedial teacher. Finally, this study will attempt to determine whether a child responds more positively to a pull-out compensatory reading program than to an in-class program.

DEFINITIONS

ATTITUDE is a position or manner indicative of feeling, opinion, or intention toward a person or thing (Morehead, 1972).
ENVIRONMENT is the aggregate of surrounding things or conditions; the totality of external influences (Morehead, 1972).
COMPENSATORY READING TEACHER is a teacher who works with a child to remediate his reading problems.
COMPENSATORY READING PROGRAM can be defined as instructional equities provided for students experiencing economic and social deprivation in the home and failure to benefit from regular classroom instruction in reading (Calfee and Drum, 1979).
IN-CLASS COMPENSATORY READING PROGRAM is a compensatory reading program within the confines of the regular classroom, but taught by a compensatory reading teacher.
PULL-OUT COMPENSATORY READING PROGRAM is a remedial reading program whereby the student leaves the regular classroom for instruction.

LIMITATIONS

One limitation is the opinionnaire which will be used to gather data, since it has not been validated. A second limitation might be the inability to get all of the subjects to

respond to the opinionnaire.

DELIMITATIONS

This survey is concerned with teachers in the participating school district and cannot be extended beyond the population sampled.

PROCEDURE

This study is an attempt to replicate the results of a study by Marie Davis (1982). It is of the descriptive type. An Opinionnaire (Attitude Scale) was administered in one school district. The purpose of the study was to survey how teachers view the effectiveness of in-class versus pull-out compensatory reading programs. The opinionnaire is of the closed-form type.

The opinionnaire consisted of a cover letter, the opinionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. The cover letter explained the purpose of the study and included a definition of the terms in-class and pull-out compensatory reading program. The cover letter also stated the deadline for completion, a request that the survey remain anonymous, and instructions for returning the opinionnaire.

The opinionnaire consisted of nine questions in which the teachers were asked to make judgments concerning program effectiveness. A third column labeled "other" was included in case the teachers found an alternative program to be more effective than an in-class or a pull-out program. Space below the opinionnaire was provided for the teachers to include any comments they wished to share.

A self-addressed stamped envelope was attached to each

opinionnaire as a means of returning it, to keep the survey anonymous and to, hopefully, increase the rate of response.

The opinionnaire was administered at the elementary level in the Elizabeth Public School District. Elizabeth was selected because it provides an in-class, a pull-out, and a combination compensatory reading program. Since there are a variety of programs implemented in Elizabeth, there is a greater chance that the teachers will have experienced the various types of programs. When a school district employs one type of compensatory program this opportunity to sample and compare programs is not available. Therefore, it is hoped that this study will be enhanced by the wide range of experience of the teachers involved.

The survey was administered in all of the seventeen elementary schools in Elizabeth. The size of the school district permitted a large sampling to be developed. The opinionnaire was administered to classroom teachers in grades one through five. It should be noted that sixth graders attend the middle school and were therefore eliminated from the study. Reading personnel and administrators were also invited to participate in the survey.

Letters were mailed to school districts requesting permission to administer the opinionnaire to personnel at the elementary level. After receiving a letter from the Elizabeth Board of Education, a meeting was arranged with Mr. Frank E. Intile, Director of Elementary Instruction and Curriculum. At this meeting with Mr. Intile, approval was granted and the finer details of administration discussed.

I met with the principals of the elementary schools and distributed a packet of opinionnaires to each. Each opinionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. The building principal ensured that the opinionnaires would be distributed to the teachers

within each school. The opinionnaires were completed and returned during a three-week interval after which the data was compiled and tabulated.

RESULTS

The opinionnaire consisted of nine questions and a section at the end for comments. Each response was indicated by placing a check mark in the appropriate space.

The opinionnaires were returned by mail and totaled 193. The responses for each category were tallied and then converted into a percentage. The percentage for each category has been listed in Table I.

The first question stated, "I am a ___ Classroom Teacher, ___ Compensatory Teacher, or ___ Other (Please Specify)." There were 158 responses under the category of classroom teacher which accounted for 82% of those surveyed. Three of the respondents also noted that they have had experience teaching compensatory education as well.

Compensatory teacher, which was the second category included 24 replies which accounted for 12% of those surveyed. One compensatory teacher noted that her experience included working in a classroom as well as in compensatory education.

The third category was checked by 11 people and accounted for 6% of those surveyed. Those respondents who checked the "other" category were asked to specify what their role was in the school. Included in the survey were two principals, two resource teachers, a Chapter I Remedial teacher, three bilingual teachers, a librarian, a special education teacher, and a music teacher.

The second question stated, "My school conducts a(n) ___ Pull-Out Program, ___ In-Class Program, or ___ Other (Please

TABLE I

PULL-OUT VERSUS IN-CLASS COMPENSATORY READING PROGRAMS

Directions: Please indicate each response by placing a check mark in the appropriate space.

1. I am a
   - 82% Classroom Teacher
   - 12% Compensatory Teacher
   - 6% Other (Please Specify) _____

2. My school conducts a(n)
   - 92% Pull-Out Program
   - 6% In-Class Program
   - 2% Other (Please Specify) _____

3. Do you believe that compensatory programs are generally worthwhile?
   - 64% Yes
   - 27% No
   - 9% Other (Please Specify) _____

	Pull-Out	In-Class	Other
4. Which program provides less classroom interruptions?	54%	38%	8%
5. Which program enables more feed-back on student progress between compensatory and classroom teacher?	34%	46%	20%
6. Which program provides more opportunities for classroom teachers to become aware of compensatory program objectives?	24%	55%	21%
7. Children are distracted more in a _____ program.	33%	58%	9%
8. Which program is more beneficial to the identified students?	53%	26%	21%
9. If I had input in the administrative decision which determines which instructional mode is implemented in my school, I would suggest a _____ compensatory program.	46%	25%	29%

Comments: _____

_____

Specify)." There were 177 responses under the category of pull-out program. This accounted for 92% of those surveyed. Twenty respondents noted that an in-class program also existed. Two teachers explained that there was both an in-class and a pull-out program due to a building fire. One respondent noted that the pull-out program involved team-teaching. The final remark was that some remediation takes place in the classroom if the teacher strongly desires it and if the pull-out teacher is cooperative.

Eleven respondents stated that an in-class program has been conducted in their school. This accounted for 6% of those surveyed.

There were 5 replies to the "other" category which accounted for 2% of those surveyed. One respondent noted that a hybrid program was conducted. This consisted of team-teaching, tutoring, and a pull-out program. Another stated that team-teaching with a modified Joplin Plan was conducted in her school. Others replied that a pull-out program was in effect but that the compensatory teachers worked on the same skills as the classroom teacher. The only difference was that the compensatory teacher worked at a simpler level.

The third question asked was, "Do you believe that compensatory programs are generally worthwhile? ___ Yes, ___ No, or ___ Other (Please Specify)." One hundred twenty-three replied "yes" which accounted for 64% of those surveyed. The following comments were included on the opinionnaires. Respondents felt that compensatory education enhances self-esteem and promotes motivation. Others stated that the money spent on compensatory teachers should be used to reduce class size. Effective programs were described as depending upon the teacher and the continuity of instruction. One respondent noted that time is lost when the pupils change classes. Finally, it was noted that compensatory programs would

be worthwhile if they weren't cancelled so often.

There were 53 respondents who answered "no" to the third question. This comprised 27% of the teachers surveyed. Suggestions included the placement of compensatory students in a self-contained compensatory education class of 10 or 12 students. These students would remain with the compensatory teacher all day. Another suggestion was that the money would be better spent in reducing class size. The final comment was that compensatory teachers fail to study the reading program being implemented and that they lack a background in phonics.

There were 17 replies to the "other" category which accounted for 9% of those surveyed. Suggestions included better communication and cooperation between the teachers involved. An alternative to compensatory education is to reduce class size. It was noted that programs would be effective if compensatory teachers weren't used as substitutes and to perform various other duties in the school. A final remark was that the children should be scheduled for compensatory reading at the same time the classroom teacher gives reading instruction. This would prevent the child from missing another subject and it would not require the regular classroom teacher to compensate for the lost work.

The fourth question stated, "Which program provides less classroom interruptions? ___ Pull-Out, ___ In-Class, or ___ Other." There were 105 responses for the pull-out program which comprised 54% of those surveyed. One comment was that the in-class program causes too much commotion.

There were 73 replies for the in-class program which accounted for 38% of those surveyed. Respondents noted the use of small groups and team-teaching.

There were 15 respondents who chose the "other" category. This comprised 8% of the people surveyed. Alternatives to a pull-out or an in-class compensatory program included

ability grouping, team-teaching, reduced class size, and creation of a compensatory class. Another suggestion was that children should be qualified by their skill needs rather than by CAT test results. The child should be able to derive assistance periodically during the year as needs arise.

The fifth question stated, "Which program enables more feedback on student progress between compensatory and classroom teacher? ___ Pull-Out, ___ In-Class, or ___ Other." There were 66 responses in the pull-out category which accounted for 34% of those surveyed. One respondent noted that there is no time allotted for conferences, which are essential for good communication.

There were 88 respondents who selected the in-class program. This comprised 46% of those surveyed.

The "other" category was chosen by 39 people and accounted for 20% of those surveyed. Alternatives to a pull-out or in-class program included smaller regular classes, ability grouping, and team-teaching. It was also noted that the amount or quality of feedback depends upon the teacher.

The sixth question asked, "Which program provides more opportunities for classroom teachers to become aware of compensatory program objectives? ___ Pull-Out, ___ In-Class, or ___ Other."

There were 47 respondents who selected the pull-out program. This comprised 24% of those surveyed. One respondent noted that it required the teachers involved to have good communication and to be able to work together.

There were 105 respondents who chose an in-class program. This accounted for 55% of those surveyed. One respondent explained that it is possible to become aware of the objectives when a classroom teacher can hear the compensatory teacher working with the child.

There were 41 responses in the "other" category. This

comprised 21% of those surveyed. Alternatives included ability grouping, small regular classes, and team-teaching. Respondents also noted that a conference is required and that the success of a program depends upon the teachers involved.

The seventh question stated, "Children are distracted more in a ___ program. The choices were ___ Pull-Out, ___ In-Class, or ___ Other." There were 64 respondents who selected a pull-out program. This comprised 33% of those surveyed. One comment was that it is a distraction to the class when the child leaves and enters the room for compensatory classes.

There were 111 responses in the in-class category. This accounted for 58% of those surveyed.

Eighteen respondents chose the "other" category, which comprised 9% of those surveyed. Five respondents found both programs to be distracting.

The eighth question was, "Which program is more beneficial to the identified students? ___ Pull-Out, ___ In-Class, or ___ Other. One hundred two respondents chose the pull-out program, which accounted for 53% of those surveyed. It was noted that since children are easily distracted, an in-class program would be a difficult situation.

There were fifty respondents who chose the in-class program. This accounted for 26% of those surveyed.

Forty-one respondents selected the "other" category as the most beneficial program. This comprised 21% of those surveyed. Alternatives mentioned were smaller regular classes, an individualized reading program, ability grouping, and a combination of team-teaching, tutoring, and a pull-out program.

The final question was, "If I had input in the administrative decision which determines which instructional mode is implemented in my school, I would suggest a ___ compensatory program. The choices were ___ Pull-Out, ___ In-Class, or ___ Other."

The section for comments will be included with question nine, since the respondents utilized the space to explain the final question. Eighty-nine respondents selected a pull-out program as the instructional mode they would implement in their school. This comprised 46% of those surveyed. The following comments and suggestions were included on the opinionnaires. "When a child is placed in a pull-out program the teacher has more time to spend with the other children in the class who also need individualized help but do not qualify for compensatory education. Compensatory education teachers are used as substitutes to cover classes. The usage of CAT scores is not always a good judgment of those children who need remediation. An alternative might be to use the input of the previous year's teacher. A successful pull-out program requires cooperation and communication between the compensatory education teacher and the classroom teacher. A pull-out program provides a better opportunity for the child to concentrate. The classroom teacher should be flexible. The compensatory education teacher should be a master teacher. A pull-out program reduces student embarrassment, reduces distractions, and prevents the other children in the class from knowing the level he's working at. "

"The pull-out program is the lesser of two evils. An in-class program is more distracting. However, the pull-out program distracts when the child leaves and enters the room. Compensatory education needs a hands-on approach rather than a ditto-based program. The one-to-one help is good. Working in smaller groups is better for the children. Classroom teachers cannot do justice to the regular students when they are responsible for compensatory education students at the same time."

"The Title I and Compensatory Education programs should not be combined. Children need one-to-one attention. It

is an inconvenience for the classroom teacher to schedule around the compensatory education pull-out program. A teacher can give extra attention when there aren't twenty to twenty-five students in the room at one time. The classroom and compensatory education programs need to be coordinated. Teachers need time in their schedules so they can meet and discuss the student's progress on a frequent and consistent basis. Finally, the success of a pull-out program depends upon the teachers involved."

Forty-eight respondents chose the in-class program which accounted for 25% of those surveyed. The following comments were included. "The compensatory teacher needs to compliment the deficiencies that the child encounters in class. An in-class program is preferable because children dislike leaving the room and the classroom teacher must work around the compensatory education teacher's schedule. Compensatory programs need closer supervision because the compensatory teachers are frequently cancelling classes so they can attend to other duties within the school."

"An in-class program is much more effective than a pull-out program. Finally, compensatory education teachers should have classroom experience before they are placed in a situation where they must deal with severe problems."

Fifty-six of the respondents prefer a program other than the pull-out or in-class approach. This accounted for 29% of those surveyed."The money spent on compensatory education programs should be spent to reduce class size. If the classroom teacher uses a visual-auditory method, the compensatory teacher should use a hands-on kinesthetic method. The child needs to use a different modality."

"Compensatory education teachers are frequently the least experienced because they are the least expensive for school districts to hire. These teachers should be top-notch

master teachers in order to see more effective results."

"Children should remain in class with their regular teacher, as they need more time to interact with their regular teacher. The classroom teacher never has the whole class intact at one time. The compensatory teacher should instruct the child at the same time the classroom teacher gives her reading lesson. This would solve the problem of the child missing other subjects."

"If classroom teachers were given less paperwork, less students, and more materials, they could reach all the student levels in the class without compensatory education programs."

"The identified students need more than skills. They also suffer from emotional and physical problems. Our programs just scratch at the surface of the problem. Additional psychologists and trained professionals are needed to deal with these students."

"The classroom teacher should be responsible for deciding which children receive compensatory services. An in-class program requires an adequate amount of space in order to be effective. The amount of time a child spends in a compensatory class should be limited to thirty minutes a day rather than forty-five."

"Promotion to the next grade should be by reading achievement only. Finally, the school should provide both an in-class and a pull-out compensatory education program and let the classroom teacher choose one."

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study demonstrated that there is a significant difference between teacher attitudes towards a pull-out versus an in-class compensatory reading program, as

stated in the hypothesis.

This study attempted to answer several minor questions. A large percentage of the teachers surveyed exhibited a negative attitude towards in-class compensatory reading programs; this hypothesis was accepted.

There was an overwhelming response in the "comments" section of the opinionnaire. The reactions and suggestions clearly demonstrate the importance of a teacher's attitudes upon the learning environment of the child; this hypothesis was also accepted.

The third hypothesis that the teachers surveyed would believe that a pull-out reading program provides the best learning environment for the remediation of the child was accepted. The findings clearly show this pattern of belief.

A significant number of teachers felt that an in-class compensatory reading program enabled more feed-back on student progress and provided a better opportunity for communication between the classroom and the remedial reading teacher allowing the acceptance of the fourth hypothesis.

Finally, this study presented evidence to show that a child responds more positively to a pull-out compensatory reading program, which may result in reduced student embarrassment and fewer distractions, than to an in-class program. However, other attitudes were discussed by teachers.

The teachers were also asked to state which compensatory reading program they would suggest if they had input in the administrative decision which determines which program is to be implemented in their school system. While a significant number of teachers suggested that a pull-out compensatory reading program be implemented in their school, it must be noted that this opinion was chosen by less than half of the sample with 54% of the sample choosing either an in-class method or an alternate to either of these models. The

last hypothesis was rejected.

IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this research study was to determine the best environment for remedial reading instruction. A significant number of teachers demonstrated a negative attitude towards in-class compensatory reading programs. The teachers surveyed believe that a pull-out reading program provides the best learning environment for the remediation of the child.

This study was an attempt to replicate the results of a study by Marie Davis (1982). The same opinionnaire, when administered in different school districts yielded contradictory results. The Davis study found that the teachers surveyed preferred an in-class compensatory program. This researcher discovered that a large number of teachers surveyed suggested the implementation of a pull-out compensatory reading program. The discrepancy in results suggests the need for further research.

The research which compares one compensatory program to another is limited. The evidence is contradictory and makes it impossible to draw any conclusions. There is a need for additional studies to be conducted. The attention should be focused on the characteristics of successful compensatory reading programs which will hopefully lead to the improvement of the education of the culturally deprived.

RELATED RESEARCH

In order to discuss the topic of compensatory education, one must first examine the reasons for its inception.

> An all too frequent consequence of economic deprivation and the accompanying alienation from the mainstream of American life is an intellectual and social deficit that perpetuates itself from generation to generation. A self-perpetuating and downward social spiral is set up in some families such that the consequences of extreme poverty in one generation create a set of circumstances which prevent parents from adequately ministering to their children's social and intellectual needs. This lack of social nurturance results in delayed development which puts the child at a serious disadvantage compared with his more affluent classmates upon entry into public school. The initial disadvantage and the family's continuing isolation from the community's cultural and social mainstream create a poor prognosis for the child's educational and social future (Ramey and Campbell, 1979).

The child therefore enters school at a disadvantage and may develop negative attitudes towards school. In the 1960s compensatory education programs were created to counter the effects of poverty on children.

Since its inception, compensatory education has been plagued by controversy. The effectiveness of compensatory programs has been questioned and critics have claimed that the money spent has been wasted. Frank Riessman (1977) states that the nation-wide evaluation studies fail to show that compensatory programs result in learning gains. He further explains that there are problems with these studies and that they have caused a great deal of confusion. The major emphasis has been on the search for evidence to justify whether these programs should continue to receive funding from the federal government (Cooley, 1981). Time should instead be spent on improving the education of disadvantaged children.

An examination of compensatory education programs reveals that there are a number of ways in which to conduct a remedial program. In-Class, Mainstreaming, Pull-Out programs, or a combination approach may be utilized. An In-Class program is one in which the compensatory reading teacher works with the child within the confines of the regular classroom. This type of program provides an opportunity for communication between the classroom and compensatory reading teacher. It also enables the classroom teacher to become aware of the objectives of the program.

Mainstreaming, as defined by the National Institute of Education (1978) is supplemental instruction delivered within the regular classroom. This term which has been borrowed from Special Education, places the burden of remediation upon the classroom teacher.

A Pull-Out program is one in which the student leaves the regular classroom to be instructed by the compensatory reading teacher. This program provides a different learning environment where the child receives small-group instruction. Unless the compensatory teacher shares the room with another teacher, the lessons may be of the less-restrictive type.

School districts have either chosen one of the programs previously mentioned, or a combination or modification of them. The difference in compensatory programs from one district to another only complicates the issue when an attempt is made to compare or contrast programs.

An examination of research on compensatory education must first deal with the issue of where the responsibility lies. Research by Bloom, Davis, and Hess (1965) found that basic learning up to the age of five or six influences later learning. If the home fails to provide the child with this basic learning, then the schools must take the responsibility. Bloom, Davis, and Hess cite two reasons. First, it is to help

the individual child, and second, so the effort of the school during the next ten years is not in vain.

Learning to read requires strong motivation, concentration, and energy (Carlson, 1972). Schools tend to blame the child for the lack of motivation. Carlson further states that observations of the divergent learner reveal that the blame should not be placed on the child or his family, but rather on the community and school.

Gordon and Wilkerson (1966) criticize that our teacher-training programs and programs of education for the disadvantaged are weak. They claim the teaching-learning process is not keeping pace with the changes in society.

Research on compensatory programs for the most part deals with the pull-out approach. There are many components of a pull-out reading program and each issue is controversial in itself.

The National Survey of Compensatory Education which was conducted by the National Institute of Education (1978) found that compensatory reading instruction across the nation was predominantly of the pull-out type. Glass and Smith (1977) conclude that the practice of pulling students out of the regular classroom for compensatory teaching is universal. They found that 75% of compensatory students receive pull-out instruction.

One explanation given for the predominance of pull-out compensatory reading programs has been the existence of Title I regulations. David G. Savage (1981) suggests that narrowly focused aid programs directed from Washington have turned education into a bureaucratic system. There are over fifty different education grant programs in existence. The requirements and regulations are very precise and tend to be distorted.

The National Institute of Education (1978) found that

many states and school districts employ a pull-out program for two reasons. First they believe it is a Title I regulation. Second, it is easier to prove that a special program exists if it is physically isolated from the regular classroom. This study found that Title I requires a special program for the eligible students, but there is no requirement that it be a pull-out program. There were two conclusions drawn by the National Institute of Education concerning the practice of pull-out instruction. First, there are few models of alternative approaches available. Second, states and school districts are concerned about proving the existence of programs and have chosen the pull-out approach.

Compensatory reading programs were created to help the child who could not function successfully at grade-level. Margaret Dyreson (1979) found that the pull-out strategy can be used successfully to provide more intensive instruction to help the child maintain grade-level achievement. This approach provides a time, a place, and special guidance.

A program that builds on the child's strengths is more likely to be effective than one which stresses the child's deficits and weaknesses (Riessman, 1977). Margaret Dyreson (1979) found that the pull-out program increases the time a child spends on basic skills learning. A classroom is geared for the average student. Deficient students are frequently unable to complete classroom tasks successfully. A diagnostic-prescriptive approach can be used to remediate students with deficient skills. Time and practice are the factors which make pull-out programs effective (Dyreson, 1979). The National Institute of Education (1978) found that individualization exists in pull-out programs rather than in regular classrooms where some teachers feel it is too much work.

Daniel U. Levine (1982) discovered that the practice

of removing students from the regular classroom was deficient for four reasons. First the child will be labeled by his peers as a "dummy". Second, the regular classroom instruction will be detracted from by complications in scheduling. Third, a student may become confused by the different methods and materials of each teacher. Finally, the regular teacher may not feel responsible for the low-achieving students.

First, we will examine the problem of stigmatization. The National Institute of Education (1978) surveyed teachers and concluded that the teachers did not feel it was a large problem. They noted that the children were often self-conscious. However, they stated that the children realized they had academic problems and wanted the extra help. This study also pointed out that stigmatization exists in the regular classroom as well, and is not just a problem of the pull-out program. Children who receive extra instruction in front of their peers are also self-conscious. The teachers further stated that in schools where there is frequent movement in and out of classrooms (ex. Gifted and Talented, Instrumental Music Lessons) children are not as likely to be singled out as receiving special help.

The second problem as stated by Levine is scheduling. Margaret Dyreson (1979) found that pull-out at the junior and senior high school level is scheduled as an entire period. However, at the primary and elementary level scheduling becomes a problem. At the elementary level, one-fifth of the pulled-out students miss regular instruction in the subject in which they are receiving special help (Glass and Smith, 1977). One-fourth of the students miss social studies, one-seventh miss science, and one-third miss no academic subjects because they are pulled from study periods in their regular classroom.

Roger Shuy (National Institute of Education, 1978) pointed out that the teachers surveyed were not too concerned about the subjects students were missing. They felt that if the

students missed a little now it would be preferable to their missing out on learning to read and write, which are essential skills.

Some of the students might be confused by different methods and materials of the classroom and compensatory reading teacher. David G. Savage (1981) stated that research studies demonstrate that children, particularly the younger ones, learn best by one teacher instead of having their day fragmented. Low-achieving students also learn best with their middle-class peers in the room. It must be noted that some students may react positively to a new approach and different materials. No generalizations can be applied, as each child is an individual and may react differently.

There is also the problem of the classroom teacher not feeling responsible for children receiving remedial help. A possible solution to this problem would be for the teachers involved to establish a good rapport with each other which would improve communication about the child's progress. This might help to define both the skills the child is deficient in, and each teacher's role in the remediation process.

The child has three chances in four of receiving instruction by a specialist (Glass and Smith, 1977). The problem is that the specialist usually receives little training and no extra pay. Today the problem is more complicated by school closings and budget cuts. Teachers hired for remedial positions may be first-year teachers with little or no training in the areas in which they are to remediate.

The economy has also forced us to examine program expenses. The pull-out program is twice as expensive per pupil as the regular classroom instruction (Glass and Smith, 1977). The reason for the increased expenditure is the smaller class size. The dilemma school districts face is whether the one-to-one instruction is worth the added expense.

Another important issue is attitude, both the attitude of the teacher and the student. When a teacher is aware of the potential of her pupils, it influences her attitude and the child's performance as well (Gordon and Wilkerson, 1966). A warm and accepting teacher who expects that children can learn will be effective. Thorsten R. Carlson (1972) states that reading achievement depends on the child's attitudes, information, and general background.

Michael J. Breen (1979) also concluded that the teacher's personality and attitude toward the subject matter are instrumental in teaching the child.

Anthony D. Fredericks (1982) states that the elementary years are crucial in developing reading attitudes. Other factors such as classroom organization, the instructional program, and content affect attitudes. Teachers reflect their attitude toward subject matter (Breen, 1979). Student attitude is directly influenced by the degree of enthusiasm, knowledge, and interest a teacher displays. Michael J. Breen therefore concludes that the interest or disinterest a teacher has towards the subject matter being taught determines the development of student attitudes toward school.

Anthony D. Fredericks (1982) reviewed 110 research studies published between 1900 and 1977 and suggests that if teachers are aware of students' attitudes when planning instruction, they can help to foster positive attitudes.

Another controversial issue is the determination of which students are to receive the services. Teachers often question why certain students receive remediation while others seem to be in greater need of the services. According to William W. Cooley (1981) there is a controversy as to who Title I should serve, the economically disadvantaged or the educationally disadvantaged. This is another unresolved issue which requires additional attention.

When deciding which program to implement one is faced with a dilemma. The National Institute of Education (1978) has outlined the major problems. First, should the child be separated from the regular classroom and possibly develop a poor self-image as the result of being stigmatized by classmates? Should we keep the classroom intact and ignore the powerful methods available for working with learning disabilities? Third, considering the cost, which program is more effective? Which subjects can be missed with the least trauma? How can we refer to programs whose terms are poorly defined? What are the results of the available research?

Research evidence is inconclusive on most of the topics involving compensatory education (National Institute of Education, 1978). The research concerning the effectiveness of compensatory programs is ambiguous and often contradictory. An examination of successful teaching strategies may help to shed some light on this problem.

The results of a study conducted by M.K.Gillis (1981) demonstrated that effective reading programs are not dependent upon one specific approach, set of materials, or instructional techniques. There are a number of areas that together result in effective reading programs for poor readers. First, Gillis states that reading should be a goal and a priority. Second, it requires that a great deal of time be spent on teaching reading and language arts. It necessitates that the best resources, people, and materials be committed to reading. Gillis suggests using a variety of materials aimed at meeting individual reading needs. This would not necessarily run into a lot of money. Instead of purchasing thirty copies of a reader, school districts could order ten copies of three different readers to cut down on the expense. Gillis advocates the use of teacher-made materials and encourages teachers to share their ideas with each other. The final suggestion is that

leadership be provided to involve the staff.

David G. Savage (1981) claims that Washington can only provide poor school districts with the additional money needed. He states that good principals and good teachers are what is needed to improve education.

A study by Ronald Edmonds (Levine, 1982) concluded that there were common characteristics that effective schools shared. They include outstanding leadership, clearly stated objectives and instruction, a good atmosphere, high expectations for students, and an emphasis on measuring student progress.

The result of a Phi Delta Kappa Study listed six areas which led to successful schools (Levine, 1982). Effective schools included effective leadership, inservice training for the staff, and reductions in the adult-child ratios. Clearly stated objectives, a structured learning environment, and parental involvement were also mentioned.

Bloom, Davis, and Hess (1965) warned that a single change on the part of a school district (ex. textbook, smaller class size) would not solve their problems. They suggest that the teacher begin at the child's level and proceed in a direction that would hopefully bring the child up to a level where he could function successfully. There were six recommendations that Bloom, Davis, and Hess included. When the child enters first grade the teacher should determine the level of perceptual development, language development, and motivation to learn. No single approach should be utilized, but rather a number of methods. During the first three years the child's progress should be carefully monitored and every effort should be made to see that the child succeeds. Another recommendation is that a national commission be created to outline curricular materials and methods. Finally, Bloom, Davis, and Hess advocate parent involvement and careful selection

of the teaching staff.

The National Institute of Education (1978) states that the effectiveness of any compensatory program is dependent upon the teachers and the administrators. Margaret Dyreson (1979) has listed five qualities of an effective pull-out program. She states that the principal and teachers should be involved in the selection of the goals. Eligibility of students should be clearly defined. The skills, steps, and plan of the program need to be outlined. Finally, arrangements must be made to promote communication.

Brophy (1982) has pinpointed eight areas that contribute to successful teaching. These include high teacher expectations, devoting most of the time to learning, curriculum pacing, and active teaching. Classroom management, teaching skills, and providing a supportive learning environment were also mentioned.

What conclusions can we draw about the effectiveness of compensatory education programs? David G. Savage (1981) concludes that there is no evidence that children in these special programs learn more than children not exposed to these remedial services. Thorsten R. Carlson (1972) states that school districts are not developing programs for young children which stress intellectual development.

There is little experimental evidence to demonstrate the effects of the pull-out technique on a child's academic progress (Glass, 1977). John T. Guthrie (1977) likewise concludes that more research is necessary before we can make a judgment about the effectiveness of compensatory education.

The evidence gathered by the National Institute of Education (1978) demonstrated that compensatory instruction has a considerable effect on learning. This study indicates that it is possible for school districts to create a successful compensatory program. First graders achieved gains

of twelve months in reading and eleven months in mathematics during a seven-month period. The former director of the National Institute of Education, Patricia Graham, stated that we now know why the poor are unable to learn. Family backgrounds, low expectations on the part of the school staff, inadequate curricula, and inadequate demands on students were cited as the cause.

Bloom, Davis, and Hess (1965) claim that studies have indeed proven that it is possible to demonstrate progress in the education of the culturally deprived.

William W. Cooley (1981) recommends that school districts be given the freedom to choose how the funds would be most effectively allocated within their own districts. He suggests that the funds be used on the primary grades to reduce class size, to attract very effective teachers, and to provide leadership within the school.

In conclusion, I have presented the available research on compensatory education and, more specifically, the pull-out approach. The evidence is contradictory and makes it impossible to draw any conclusions. It does however, point out the need for additional studies to be conducted. More attention should be given to the characteristics of successful programs and the improvement of the education of the culturally deprived.

Gene V. Glass (1977) states that the pull-out problem has not received much attention. However, he adds that it could very well be one of the factors that will have a great deal of influence.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Alexander, J. Estill, and Ronald C. Filler. Attitudes and Reading. Delaware: International Reading Association, 1976.

Bailey, Stephen K. "Education in the Eighties: The Case for Optimism." The National Elementary Principal, 59:14-16, June, 1980.

Bereiter, Carl. "A Constructive Look at Follow Through Results." Interchange, 12:1-21, No.1, 1981.

Bloom, Benjamin S., Allison Davis, and Robert Hess. Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Breen, Michael J. "Teacher Interest and Student Attitude Toward Four Areas of Elementary School Curriculum." Education. 100:63-66, No.1, 1979.

Brophy, Jere. "Successful Teaching Strategies For the Inner-City Child." Phi Delta Kappan, 63:527-30, April, 1982.

Calfee, Robert C., and Priscilla A. Drum. Teaching Reading in Compensatory Classes. Delaware: International Reading Association, 1979.

Carlson, Thorsten R. Administrators and Reading. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.

Cooley, William W. "Effectiveness of Compensatory Education." Educational Leadership, 38:298-301, January, 1981.

Davis, Marie, "A Survey of Teacher Attitudes Towards In-Class

Versus Pull-Out Compensatory Reading Programs" Unpublished Master's Thesis, Kean College, Union, N.J., April, 1982.

Davis, Patsy M. "An Evaluation of Journal Published Research on Attitudes in Reading, 1900-1977." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1978.

Dyreson, Margaret. "Pull-Out" Programs for Basic Skills Instruction. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 182 290, May 1979.

Fredericks, Anthony D. "Developing Positive Reading Attitudes." The Reading Teacher, 36:38-41, October, 1982.

Gillis, M.K. Federal Support Has Resulted in Effective Programs for Poor Readers in Small Schools. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 209 650, October, 1981.

Glass, Gene V., and Mary Lee Smith. "Pull-Out" in Compensatory Education. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 160 723, November, 1977.

Gordon, Edmund W., and Doxey A. Wilkerson. Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged, Programs and Practices: Preschool Through College. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Guthrie, John T. "Follow Through: A Compensatory Education Experiment." The Reading Teacher, 31:240-244, November, 1977.

Levine, Daniel U. "Successful Approaches For Improving Academic

Achievement In Inner-City Elementary Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, 63:523-26, April, 1982.

Morehead, Albert and Loy. Webster Dictionary. Chicago: New American Library, 1972.

National Institute of Education. Perspectives on the Instructional Dimensions Study: A Supplemental Report from the National Institute of Education. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 174 728, November, 1978.

Ramey, Craig T., and Frances A. Campbell. "Compensatory Education for Disadvantaged Children." School Review, 87:171-189, February, 1979.

Rees, Helen E. Deprivation and Compensatory Education: A Consideration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Riessman, Frank. "Has Compensatory Education Failed?" The National Elementary Principal, 56:14-18, May/June, 1977.

Savage, David G. "The Federally Supported Schoolhouse." The Education Digest, 47:2-4, September, 1981.